1 p

```
POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
 2
                            STATE OF WASHINGTON
   IN THE MATTER OF
   WILLIAM NYSTROM and
   NORTHWESTERN ROOFING, INC.,
   d.b.a. Peterman Roofing,
 5
                                           PCHB No. 78-5
                   Appellants,
 6
                                           FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
              ν.
 7
                                           CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
                                           AND ORDER
   PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION
8
   CONTROL AGENCY,
9
                   Respondent.
10
11
        This matter, the appeal of a $250 civil penalty for emissions from
12
   a roofing tanker allegedly in violation of respondent's Section 9.03(b)
13
   of Regulation I came on for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings
14
   Board, Dave J. Mooney, Chairman, and Chris Smith, Member, convened at
15
   Seattle, Washingtor on March 27, 1978. Hearing examiner William A.
16
   Harrison presided. Respondent elected a formal hearing pursuant to
```

Appellants appeared by and through their attorney, Grant S. Meiner.

BEFORE THE

RCW 43.21B.230.

17

18

Respondent appeared by and through its attorney, Feith D. McGoffin. Olympia court reporter Christina M. Check recorded the proceedings.

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were examined. testirony heard and exhibits examined, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes these

## FINDINGS OF FACT

Ι

Respondent, pursuant to PCW 43.21B.260, has filed with this Hearings Board a certified copy of its Regulation I containing respondent's regulations and amendments thereto, of which official notice is taken.

ΙI

On November 30, 1977, appellants' employees brought a roofing tanker, containing rolten asphalt, from a job site to the appellants' storage yard on NW 40th Street in Seattle, Washington. Respondent, Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency (PSAPCA), received a telephone complaint about smoke and odor emanating from the appellants' yard. At approximately 4.00 p.m. on that same day, respondent's inspector went to the scene and observed that appellants' tanker was standing with the hatch ajar and that white smoke was arising from it. The irspector verified that the tanker contained an undetermined amount of molten asphalt and estimated the temperature inside the tanker to be around 475°F. At this temperature the plume which rose from the tanker was smoke (condensed hydrocarbons), and not water vapor.

Appellants caused emissions aggregating at least six consecutive minutes and of an opacity ranging from 50 to 60 percent.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 27 A'D ORDER

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Appellant received Notice and Order of Civil Penalty No. 3611 citing Section 9.03(b) of respondent's Regulation I and assessing a civil penalty of \$250. From this penalty, appellants appeal. Section 9.03(b) of respondent's Regulation I states:

After July 1, 1975, it shall be unlawful for any person to cause or allow the emission of any air contaminant for a period or periods aggregating more than three (3) minutes in any one hour, which is:

- (1) Darker in shade than that designated as No. 1 (20% density) on the Ringelmann Chart, as published by the United States Eureau of Mines; or
- (2) Of such opacity as to obscure an observer's view to a degree equal to or greater than does smoke described in Subsection 9.03(b)(1); provided that, 9.03(b)(2) shall not apply to fuel burning equipment utilizing wood residue when the particulate emission from such equipment is not greater than 0.05 grain per standard cubic foot.

ΙV

Emissions such as these might be avoided by lowering the temperature within the tanker and, if then safe to do so, closing the hatch.

V

Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings, the Pollution Control Hearings Board comes to these

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ι

In emitting an air contaminant, smoke, for more than three minutes in any one hour, which contaminant is of an opacity obscuring an observer's view to a degree equal to or greater than the smoke designated as No. 1 on the Ringelmann Chart, appellants violated Section 9.03(b) of

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

 $^{23}$ 

respondent's Regulation I. 1 We draw the conclusion that smoke, such as appellants emitted, is 2 an air contaminant by reference to respondent's Section 1.07(b) which 3 defines air cortaminant as "smoke" or "other particulate matter." 4 "Particulate matter" is defined as "any material, except water in an 5 uncombined form, that is or has been airborne and exists as a liquid or 6 solid at standard conditions." Section 1.07(v). 7 ΙI 8 Any Finding of Fact thich should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is 9 hereby adopted as such. 10 From these Conclusions, the Board enters this 11 ORDER 12 The \$250 civil penalty assessed by Notice and Order of Civil Penal+ 13 No. 3611 is hereby affirred. 14 day of April, 1978. 15 POLIMITION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

<u> 1</u>0

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

25